

Matthew Franklin Jaksa (CA State Bar No. 248072)  
HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP  
560 Mission Street, 25<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2994  
Telephone: (415) 268-2000  
Facsimile: (415) 268-1999  
Email: matt.jaksa@hro.com

Attorneys for Plaintiffs,  
LAFACE RECORDS LLC; UMG  
RECORDINGS, INC.; and SONY BMG  
MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

LAFACE RECORDS LLC, a Delaware limited  
liability company; UMG RECORDINGS, INC.,  
a Delaware corporation; and SONY BMG  
MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT, a Delaware  
general partnership,

Plaintiffs,

v.

JOHN DOE #5,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 3:07-CV-04839-EMC

**Honorable Edward M. Chen**

***EX PARTE APPLICATION TO CONTINUE  
CASE MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE  
AND EXTEND TIME TO SERVE  
DEFENDANT AND [PROPOSED] ORDER***

1 Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court continue the case management conference  
2 currently set for January 23, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. to April 23, 2008. Plaintiffs further request, pursuant  
3 to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules 4(m) and 6(b)(1)(A), that the Court grant an  
4 additional 90 days to serve Defendant with the Summons and Complaint. As further explained  
5 below, the parties have reached a provisional settlement in this case, and Plaintiffs have not yet  
6 received a response to the early discovery authorized by this Court to determine the true identity of  
7 the Doe defendant. In support of their request, Plaintiffs state as follows:  
8

9 1. The initial case management conference is set for January 23, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. The  
10 Court, acting of its own accord, previously rescheduled the case management conference from the  
11 originally scheduled date of December 26, 2007. The current deadline for service of process is  
12 January 18, 2008.  
13

14 2. Plaintiffs filed their Complaint for Copyright Infringement against Defendant John  
15 Doe #5 ("Defendant") on September 20, 2007. Plaintiffs did not have sufficient identifying  
16 information to name Defendant in the Complaint, but were able to identify Defendant by the Internet  
17 Protocol address assigned to Defendant by Defendant's Internet Service Provider ("ISP") – here,  
18 Santa Clara University.

19 3. In order to determine Defendant's true name and identity, Plaintiffs filed their *Ex*  
20 *Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate Discovery on September 20, 2007, requesting that  
21 the Court enter an Order allowing Plaintiffs to serve a Rule 45 subpoena on the ISP.

22 4. The Court entered an Order for Leave to take Immediate Discovery on November 20,  
23 2007, which was promptly served upon the ISP along with a Rule 45 subpoena. Plaintiffs thereafter  
24 granted the ISP an extension of time to respond to Plaintiffs' subpoena. To date the ISP has not  
25 supplied the subpoenaed information, but Plaintiffs expect a response from the ISP on February 8,  
26 2008.  
27  
28

1           5.       However, after being notified by the ISP of Plaintiffs' subpoena, Defendant contacted  
2 Plaintiffs, and the parties have reached a provisional settlement. The parties are now in the process  
3 of finalizing the settlement.

4           6.       Given the circumstances of this case, a case management conference is unnecessary  
5 at this time, and Plaintiffs respectfully request that the case management conference be continued to  
6 April 23, 2008. Plaintiffs also request an additional 90 days to effectuate service so that, in the event  
7 the settlement fails, Plaintiffs will have time to receive discovery from the ISP, file an amended  
8 complaint naming Defendant individually, and serve Defendant with the summons and complaint.

9           7.       Plaintiffs submit that filing their *Ex Parte* Application for Leave to Take Immediate  
10 Discovery demonstrates "good cause" under Rule 4 for an extension of time for service. *See Ritts v.*  
11 *Dealers Alliance Credit Corp.*, 989 F. Supp. 1475, 1479 (N.D. Ga. 1997) (stating good cause  
12 standard for service extensions). Unlike a traditional case in which the defendant is known by name  
13 and efforts to serve can begin immediately after filing the complaint, in this case Plaintiffs first had  
14 to seek the identity of Defendant through the subpoena to the ISP, a process that is not yet complete.  
15 This Court has discretion to enlarge the time to serve even where there is no good cause shown.  
16 *Henderson v. United States*, 517 U.S. 654, 658 n. 5 (1996).

17           8.       Because the copyright infringements here occurred in 2007, the three-year limitations  
18 period for these claims has not expired. *See* 17 U.S.C. § 507(b) (2000). There can thus be no  
19 prejudice to the Defendant from any delay in serving the Complaint.  
20

21           9.       Plaintiffs will provide the Defendant with a copy of this request and any Order  
22 concerning this request when service of process occurs.

23 Dated: January 14, 2008

HOLME ROBERTS & OWEN LLP

24  
25 By: /s/ Matthew Franklin Jaksa  
26 MATTHEW FRANKLIN JAKSA  
27 Attorney for Plaintiffs  
28 LAFACE RECORDS LLC; UMG  
RECORDINGS, INC.; and SONY BMG  
MUSIC ENTERTAINMENT

**[PROPOSED] ORDER**

Good cause having been shown:

**IT IS ORDERED** that the case management conference currently set for January 23, 2008, at 1:30 p.m. be continued to April 23, 2008.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, Rules 4(m) and 6(b)(1), Plaintiffs' time to serve the Summons and Complaint on Defendant be extended to April 17, 2008.

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_

By: \_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Edward M. Chen  
United States Magistrate Judge